



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

form important services in the cause of education.*

* We have received the above account through the courtesy of Prof. J. Squair (University College, Toronto) Secretary of the Association.

Altisländische u. altnorwegische Grammatik,
unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen,
von ADOLF NOREEN. Halle, Niemeyer,
1884, XII, 212, 8vo.

The delay in the appearance of the present review is due to a desire to do ample justice to a subject of more than ordinary difficulty. Old-Icelandic is confessedly the most complicated form of Teutonic speech. Even under Noreen's painstaking guidance one is continually liable to trip over some idiosyncrasy in phonology or inflection, that the doughty old Icelanders seem to have evolved with malice aforethought as a pitfall to the unwary. For many months Noreen's book has been my daily companion. For three months, at least, my hourly companion. I have examined and re-examined every statement under the strongest light that I could bring to bear from High German and from Anglo-Saxon. No wonder, then, if I have grown to look upon the book and its author with a feeling of strong personal attachment, amounting to gratitude. For Noreen has carried me—and many others too—over what used to appear a discouraging jungle of forms, and reduced to a rational system what used to appear without rime or reason.

If, then, the following remarks should suggest fault-finding rather than praise, I can only beg the reader to exonerate me once for all from such an ungenerous impulse. What is good in the book is above praise from any one. Whoever wishes to discover that, need not take my words; better go to the book itself and master it. Only let me call attention to one feature, in which Noreen has shown a more 'practical turn than his fellow-grammarians. Namely, §§ 137-164, 230-61, containing "etymological surveys" of the vowels and the consonants respectively. These "surveys" are to the beginner simply invaluable. Whenever one is at a loss to account for a given letter historically, one has only to turn

to it in these quasi-indexes, where he is referred to the previous paragraphs in which its genesis has been discussed at length. Further, Noreen's treatment of Verner's law, §§ 262-265 is more satisfactory than in the other grammars of this series. (Is it quite safe to attribute, § 263.3, such forms as *vissa*, *hvass*, parallel to *vita*, *kvætja*, to the operation of Verner's law?). The general treatment of Teutonic vowels, §§ 53-58, and of Ablaut, §§ 165-173, is also in the same liberal spirit. Yet the author's assumption of a primitive Teutonic a-umlaut, §§ 172.56, is evidently untenable and has already been promptly condemned.

In general, inflection plays a subordinate part to phonology. This is only in accordance with the tendency of the Younger School of philology and is almost a necessity in any scientific treatment of Icelandic. The nouns and adjectives fare better at Noreen's hands than the verbs. I cannot help thinking that some, at least, of the more puzzling variations in the indicative present should have been given more fully. By an oversight the verb *lesa* has been omitted from § 410. I do not find anywhere a discussion of the umlauted past-participles of the ablauting verbs, § 455, such as Sievers has indicated, § 378, of his grammar. True, *frörinn*, *körinn*, and the like come under the head of R-umlaut, § 68, 3. But why *tekenn* (*taka*) versus *farenn* (*fara*)?

I do not like Noreen's classification of weak verbs. It may be in accordance with tradition and practical enough for Icelandic alone, but it throws these verbs out of all parallelism with their treatment in kindred languages, that is, *-jan*, *-aian*, *-ön*. Noreen's class I = *-ön*; class II = *-jan* (short stems); class III = *-jan* (long stems); class IV = *-aian*. One has continually to stop and reconstruct the numbering, before one can compare Icelandic with German or with English.

Noreen, Sievers, Braune, Paul, all make one practical mistake, I think, in dismembering and treating in separate paragraphs phenomena that belong together organically. A notable instance is the Umlaut, another the *j-i* shifting. If Noreen in this respect is more trying to the beginner than his fellow-grammarians, the language itself is doubtless to blame for the aggravation. Thus, § 76, 3, we

read that stem *u* becomes *o* "vor einem aus *nk, nt, mp* entstandenen *kk, tt, pp*, z. b., *sokkenn*, &c., &c." What other inference can the beginner draw from this, than that the change *u* > *o* is due to the influence of the following consonant? The more so, since § 76, 1 and § 76, 2 do treat of consonantal breaking, for example, *sótt* < **sucht*, *tor-* (Gothic *tuz-*). Now, Noreen probably means nothing of the sort. The change *u* > *o* in *sokkenn* is not due to consonantal influence, but to the original **on* of the termination infecting the stem-vowel after the protecting **uk* of the stem had gone over to **kk*. In other words, this section should have been introduced sub § 55. Had Noreen introduced it there, he would have escaped the appearance of a blunder. To pursue the same line, why could not the author have treated together all cases of R-umlaut? As it is, we get the bulk of the phenomenon in §§ 68, 69, and a small remnant in § 76, 2; § 77, 2. Similarly in § 77, 3 we learn that Teutonic **i* becomes **e* before *kk, tt, pp* < *nk, nt, mp*, but no cause is assigned. Is not the conversion parallel to that already noted above in *sokkenn*? That is, the **on* of the termination has infected the stem-*i*. Given in extenso, the process would be ind. g. *sengwon* > Teut. *sinkwon* > icel. **sikkwon* > icel. *sekkva* or *sökkva*. The conversion belongs properly to sub § 56, although the "urgermanisch" there is untenable.

The point that has given me most trouble is the *j-i* shifting. To understand Noreen's treatment fully, one must keep in mind all the time the following paragraphs: §§ 58, 132, 134, 135 *An.* 2, 218; 226, 5; 260; 278-283; 294-298; 413; 423, 427-433; 453, 3. It is possible that I may have overlooked a chance statement elsewhere. Now could not all this be reduced to one general paragraph, leaving slight inflectional variations to their respective places in declension and conjugation? As the case stands, the beginner who wishes to comprehend, for example, the form *merkja* will, on turning to §§ 260, 4; 226, 5, learn that the *j* has been evolved ('entwickelt') from the palatal *k*. That is *merkja* < **merka*? Of course, the other languages will teach him at once that this **merka* must itself be from an earlier **merkja*, or **merkia*. Which is it? A consultation of § 58 (and especially of Sievers'

Grammar there referred to) and § 132 will lead him—rather tortuously—to the progression: **merkejon* > **merkjon* > **merkion* > **merka* > *merkja*. I should like to put the question: Which is better, to assume that the actual *merkja* is evolved from a **merka*, or to assume that it is only the retention of the previous *j*? Without pressing the question, may I not hold at any rate that the only satisfactory way of treating the *j-i* is to compress it all into one general paragraph, giving sufficient illustrations of long stems and short ones, both in conjugation and in declension? And may we not begin with the assertion that the disappearance from short stems of *j* before palatal vowels is *General Teutonic*? I am quite certain that a good many in Germany believe it, although we cannot bring them to the point of saying so in print. Gothic *nasjis*, *nasjiþ* need not disconcert us. That language was quite capable of restoring the *j* from the analogy of *nasja*.

In this connection Noreen has committed a slight inconsistency. In § 135, *An.* 2, speaking of the disappearance of termination vowels, he says "Auch *i* ist vielleicht schon urnordisch geschwunden, wenigstens nach kurzer wurzelsilbe, wo kein umlaut auftritt." This does not quite tally with § 453, 3, where it is argued that **i* (-*e*) of the 2. s. imperative must have existed in urnordisch because of *send* (instead of **sett*). True, *send* is a long stem. But will not the same argumentation apply to the short stem imperative *vel* (*velja*)? If *send* < **sandi* < **sandi-e* < **sandje*, then *vel* < **vali* < **valj* < **valje*.

The various umlauts are treated at length and with great wealth of detail. Especially the *u(o)*-umlaut is illuminated brilliantly. Yet the author has overlooked one minor point, that is, the carrying back of the *o*-umlaut into the penultimate, for example, in *kǫlloðu* < **kallōðu* (pret. pl. of *kalla*), *ǫnnur* < **anþaru* (cf. Gothic *anþara*).

Which is earlier, the *i*- or the *u*-Umlaut? Noreen assigns the priority, § 72, to the *i*-Umlaut. This is controverted by his reviewer in the *Lit. Centr. Blatt* (Paul?) 1886, pp. 393-394, on the strength of such syncopation as *sqðlar* < **saðular* versus *luklar* < **lukilar*. But, at bottom, does not this argument rest on the as-

sumption that syncope was a general process synchronous in all vowels after short stems, and is the assumption proved? Antecedent probability is in favor of *i* having been syncopeated earlier than *u*. In any case, the facts accumulated by Brate in his two articles on the Danish element in English and briefly indicated by Noreen in his Appendix, seem to favor slightly the priority of *i*-Umlaut.

The usefulness of the work is much enhanced by an alphabetic index to the declension and conjugation. But why not extend the index to the phonology also? Sievers has done this (for the more important phenomena, at least) in his second edition, and surely Icelandic offers at least twice as many difficulties as Anglo-Saxon.

Numerous single points need further explanation. I note here a few at random, in the hope that Noreen may be induced to discuss them. Thus, how are we to regard *merr* 'Stute'? In § 298, *An. 1*, it is cited as **merhið*, O. H. G. *meriha*. Why then do we find only *mer-* in the oblique cases (Vigfusson's Dict.)? See also A.-S. *miere* (*miere?*). Kluge's Stamm. Lehre, § 37, does not help us to understand why we should get sometimes *rr*, sometimes *r*. Again, what is the relation between *byrr* 'günstiger Fahrwind,' § 303, *An. 1* (§ 200, 2. b. α) and the *ambyrne wind* of Alfred's *Oros.* 19, 13? May not the unusual and unphonetic *dyntr* (more correct *dyttr*), § 197, *An. 2*, be an English loan? cf. *ðone dynt Past.* 339, 15 and *Bei IX.*, 242. Noreen's reduplication-preterites *sera*, *snera*, *rera*, § 421, will doubtless clear up the *s(r)* preterites that have puzzled both readers and reviewers of the *History of the Germany Language*, by Strong and Meyer, cf. MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES I., 124, *a*. Can the seemingly strong participles *valinn* (*velja*), § 429, be explained in connection with § 220, 2, that is, the interchange of *-nr* and *-pr* through false analogy?

The study of Icelandic stirs one up to all sorts of wide-reaching questions. But I must break off with the assertion that Noreen's grammar is a model of acumen and exposition.

J. M. HART.

University of Cincinnati.

Französische und englische Schulbibliothek.—Ausgewählte Erzählungen von Alphonse Daudet.—Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von ERNST GROPP. Leipzig, 1886. Gr. 8vo. Flex. cl. pp. 91. M. 1,15.

Auswahl französischer Gedichte.—Für den Schulgebrauch zusammengestellt von ERNST GROPP und EMIL HAUSKNECHT. Leipzig, 1886. Gr. 8vo. Flex. cl. pp. 224. M. 1,80.

Abriss der Französischen Verslehre von DR. ERNST GROPP. Leipzig, 1886. pp. 18. M. 0,40.

The timely series of articles in the MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES by Mr. Ferdinand Bôcher, ought to be a hint to some of our American publishers and induce them to furnish us with cheap and well selected French and German texts with adequate notes. I say cheap, because the price of the annotated text-book published by American publishers is too high; besides the notes in some of the earlier series, edited by prominent teachers, are not satisfactory. The series seem to have been undertaken merely as a commercial venture. The Germans are far in advance of us in the publication of suitable texts for class use.

The two books first mentioned above and which form part of a series of French and English texts, are well printed, in clear, large type, on excellent paper and are bound in flexible cloth. The price of the different volumes in this series ranges from M. 0,85 to M. 1,80.

I had never seen any text of this series, but had already used in French Classes, when the students were conversant with German, some texts published by the "Weidmannsche Buchhandlung," indeed, am reading with a class a selection of Victor Hugo's poems annotated by Kühne and published by Weidmann.

It is always some risk when one not to the manner born undertakes the annotation of Modern French novel writers, such as Daudet and Coppée; but Mr. Gropp's notes to his selection from Daudet's tales are sufficient and reliable. In looking over them, I notice but two slight errors: In "Les trois sommations," he explains "trique" by "eigentlich Knüttel, hier Gewehrkolben." Mr. Gropp must excuse one who has been there, *et qui est payé*